GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Chandigarh Administration Gazette

Published by Authority

NO. 159] CHANDIGARH, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2025 (KARTIKA 22, 1947 SAKA)

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

Notification

The 12th November, 2025

No. 559305-HII(2)-2025/17842.—In exercise of the Powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. 14 of 1947) read with Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment's Notification No. S-11025/21/2003-IR(PL) dated 28.7.2004, the undersigned hereby publish the following award bearing reference No. **80/2023 dated 28.08.2025** delivered by the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, UT Chandigarh between :

SUBHASH SINGH S/O SH. SATNAM SINGH, R/O H. NO. 88/2, VILLAGE DHANAS, CHANDIGARH. (WORKMAN)

AND

1. PANJAB UNIVERSITY, SECTOR 14, CHANDIGARH THROUGH ITS VICE CHANCELLOR.

2. REGISTRAR, PANJAB UNIVERSITY, SECTOR 14, CHANDIGARH. (MANAGEMENT)

AWARD

1. Workman Subhash Singh has presented the Industrial Dispute in hand under Section 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 *(here-in-after in short called 'ID Act').*

2. Briefly stated, the applicant-workman was appointed as Mali on temporary / contract / adhoc basis on 24.12.1997 by Panjab University for a fixed period of three months and thereafter he was given sanction letters / extensions after every three months. His services were terminated in the year 03.12.2003 without any reason. Juniors to him are still working and the same is clear violation of the ID Act as well as the principles of natural justice. It is submitted that applicant along with other persons approached the Hon'ble High Court by way of CWP No.3343 of 2003 titled as "Mohan Lal Versus Panjab University & Other" wherein notice of motion was issued and notice regarding stay was also issued. The respondents on coming to know about the said writ petition dismissed the applicant from the services and has not reinstated him despite assurance given by the office. No show cause notice was ever issued to the applicant. After his illegal termination, the

Signature Not Verified
Digitally signed by SUNITA SALAR
Date: 2025.11.13 16:43:15 IST
Reason: Published
Location:

This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :
https://egazette.chd.gov.in

University employed another set of temporary / adhoc employees in his place. Further, the applicant is facing great financial hardship due his illegal termination. The applicant along with other similarly situated persons approached the Hon'ble High Court for regularisation of his services vide CWPs No.266 & 8388 of 2003. The aforesaid CWPs were disposed off vide common order dated 02.08.2004 whereby the Hon'ble High Court directed that the respondents shall formulate a regularisation policy of the employees who were employed either on adhoc / contract basis for long period of time after taking into consideration similar policies which have already been framed by the State of Punjab and Haryana and shall consider the cases of the petitioners in accordance, within the period of six month from the date of order. The respondents were directed to remove the petitioners from service only to make a way for other contractual / adhoc employees. The petitioners shall only be disengaged in case of selection and appointments are made on regular basis. The respondents were granted liberty to dispense with the services of the petitioners either under the ID Act or after following due procedure in case of misconduct. The Panjab University challenged the order dated 02.08.2004 by way of filing of SLP. The leave was granted on 24.07.2009 in SLP and Civil Appeal was dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 14.05.2015 for non-prosecution.

3. The applicant submitted that the services of the applicant were not regularised and the applicant filed CWP No.7851 of 2016 which was dismissed on 15.11.2016 holding that there was delay and latches. Thereafter, the applicant filed the LPA No.924 of 2017 against the order dated 15.11.2016 and the same was withdrawn with a liberty to file Contempt of Court proceedings and other proceedings for implementation of order dated 02.08.2004 passed in CWP No.388 of 2003 titled "Om Wati & Others Versus Panjab University & Others".

4. The applicant filed COCP No.2201 of 2017 and No.2202 of 2017and the Vice Chancellor, Panjab University placed on record an affidavit to the effect that the policy has been framed on 05.03.2001 regarding regularisation of Class 'B' &'C' employees and thereafter again on 18.07.2014, policy of the class employees was framed. The COCP was rendered infructuous, however, liberty was granted to avail the alternative remedy.

5. The applicant submitted that his services were terminated on 02.09.2015. It is submitted that the applicant filed demand notice on 28.06.2023 before the Assistant Labour Commissioner-cum-Conciliation Officer but no amicable settlement was possible and the demand notice remained unsettled. It is stated that the applicant had worked with respondents for more than 240 days in a calendar year and his services were illegally terminated without any notice, charge sheet and compensation as well as without compliance of Section 25F of the ID Act. It is stated that he is not gainfully employed since the date of termination. It is prayed that the applicant may be reinstated alongwith back wages and the order of termination may be set aside being illegal, arbitrary and against the principles of natural justice.

6. The respondent No.1 & 2 filed reply to the claim statement submitting that Class 'C' workers engaged on daily wage basis approached the Hon'ble High Court of Punjab & Haryana by filing COCP No.3343 of 2003, 8388 of 2003 and 10858 of 2003 respectively, jointly-individually for regularisation of their services as they have put their services on contract basis for more than three to five years at that time. The Hon'ble High Court vide order dated 02.08.2004 disposed off the said writ petitions by passing following orders :-

> *"....That the respondents shall formulate a regularization policy of the employees who have been employed either on adhoc/contract basis for a long period of time after taking into consideration similar policies which have been framed by the State of Punjab & Haryana and shall consider the cases of the petitioners in accordance with the same within a period of six months from today. The respondents are directed not to remove the petitioners from the service to make way for other contractual/adhoc employees. The petitioners shall only be disengaged in case*

This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :
https://egazette.chd.gov.in

of selection and appointments are made on regular basis. The respondents are, however at liberty to dispense with the service of the petitioners either under the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 or after following due procedure in case of misconduct."

Thereafter, the University filed SLP No.26150-26162 in the Hon'ble Supreme Court against the decision of the Hon'ble High Court of Punjab & Haryana in the matter of making policy for regularisation and on 05.01.2005 the Hon'ble Supreme Court issued notice and ordered interim stay. Thereafter, on 24.07.2009 the Hon'ble Supreme Court granted leave and ordered that in the meantime, interim order to continue till further orders. It is submitted that Senate of the Panjab University on the recommendation of the Board of Finance and Syndicate, at its meeting held on 26.03.2006 vide para 6, approved the policy for regularisation of daily wage workers i.e. employees who were working on temporary / daily wage / contract basis in the Panjab University and in that regard, circular was issued vide No.5610-5657/Estt. Dated 19.04.2006. One Mrs. Gayatri Thakur D/o Sh. Narpal Singh Thakur and another Mrs. Nirmla Devi D/o Sh. Roshan Lal had filed a CWP No.8049 of 2006 in the Hon'ble High Court of Punjab & Haryana against Panjab University and the Hon?ble High Court issued notice of motion for 28.09.2006 and stayed the operation of circular dated 19.04.2006. The University filed CWP No.8049 of 2006 in the Hon'ble High Court of Punjab & Haryana wherein following interim order was passed :-

"Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the policy dated 19.04.2001 framed by the University for regularization of the employees who were working on temporary/daily wage/contract basis with the respondent University is ultra virus of Articles 14/16 of the constitution of India. In support of his submission, the learned counsel relies on the judgments of the Supreme Court in the case of Secretary, State of Karnataka & others versus Uma Devi & Others, JT 2006(4) SC 420.

Notice of motion for 28.09.2006 Operation of the circular dated 19.04.2006 (Annexure P-5) is stayed."

On the recommendations of the Committee and approved by the Vice-Chancellor, the posts of Class 'B' & 'C' were advertised vide Advt. No.14/2008 and some DW-Employees of Class 'C' were selected as Peon, Helper, Mali, Cleaner in Panjab University after following proper procedure as Advt. No.14/2008. The University in the light of Para 53 of decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case ***State of Karnataka Versus Uma Devi, 2006(4) SCC 1*** regularised the services of employees against the sanctioned / budgetary posts as approved by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 05.03.2011 on the conditions that -

(1) i) Those temporary employees who have -

Either completed 10 years or more of service prior to going to the Court.

OR

Not gone to the Court and above have completed 10 years or more of service on or before 31.12.2010, subject to submission of an affidavit that they have not gone to Court at any stage and their services of more than 10 years is without the intervention of Court.

ii) In counting 10 years of services, there are no breaks in service other than mandatory breaks or inevitable breaks/notional breaks.

(2) the Class 'C' employees working on temporary / daily wage / contract basis in the Panjab University, who also fulfilled the above (i) and (ii) conditions, but have not been include in this list, be also considered for appointment.

This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :
https://egazette.chd.gov.in

7. It is submitted that the University has framed the policy in the year 2011 for regularisation of Class 'B' & 'C' DW employees which was circulated vide No.5021-5170/Estt. Dated 14.03.2011 and the Syndicate in its meeting held on 18.05.2014 has approved the recommendations of the Committee. In order to calculate the number of days the Registrar has approved that -

(i) 3650 days service on or before 31.12.2010 whatever may be the gap period in service in a year. But, if the gap period is of a year or more, that period is not to be taken into consideration for counting 3650 days.

(ii) While computing 240 days in a calendar year for consecutive 10 years non-working days such as Sundays and holidays etc. are to be counted towards, a total of 240 days. For example: a candidate who was worked for 24 days in a month and availed Sunday/ holidays etc. is to be considered worked for 30 / 31 days.

In pursuance to the circular No.14881-15091/Estt. Dated 18.07.2014, the DW workers working in Panjab University submitted their claim in the prescribed performa and number of DW employees whose services had been regularised. The respondent University had sent the requisite letter vide No.16476-80/Estt. Dated 29.07.2015 to all the applicants for regularisation of their services and the number of days submitted by the applicants were duly verified by the Concerned Head of the Department.The case of the workman was considered for regularisation but he could not stand eligible for regularisation. It is submitted that the case of the workman was not covered under the policy formed by the Panjab University for regularisation of the DW employees. The University had adopted the proper procedure to disengage him as per the directions of the Hon'ble High Court vide order dated 02.08.2004 as well as under the ID Act. Denying the remaining averments, a prayer was made for dismissal of the claim statement.

8. The applicant-workman filed replication to the written statement wherein he denied averments of written statement and further submitted that after 03.12.2003, the University did not allow the applicant-workman to do his work so that the applicant did not full the requirement of the policy. On 03.12.2003, the applicant-workman went to his native village Pauri Garhwal for one week with the permission of JE of XEN Office but the applicant-workman fell ill there and remained under treatment w.e.f. 10.12.2003 to 16.08.2004 in Govt. Ayurvedic Dispensary Dhantiyal, District Pauri Garhwal (Uttranchal). On 17.08.2004, the applicant-workman submitted the medical certificate with Registrar Office, thereafter Registrar Office directed to the applicant to join the XEN Office but Sh. S. S. Saini - Deputy Executive Engineer (H) did not allow the applicant to do his work so that the applicant did not fulfil the requirement of the policy.It is reiterated that the services of the applicant-workman were forcibly terminated by the management without conducting any inquiry and termination notice.

9. From the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed vide order dated 18.09.2024 :-

1. Whether the termination of services of the workman is illegal, if so, to what effect and to what relief he is entitled to, if any ? OPW

2. Relief.

10. Thereafter, both the parties were called upon to lead their respective evidence.

11. In evidence of the workman, the applicant-workman himself appeared as AW1 and tendered his affidavit **Exhibit 'AW1/A'.** He also tendered into evidence copies of documents -

Order dated 02.08.2004 passed by Hon'ble High Court in CWP No.8388 of 2003	**Exhibit 'W1'**

This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit : https://egazette.chd.gov.in

Order dated 14.05.2015 passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No.4833-4845 of 2009	**Exhibit 'W2'**
Order dated 30.05.2017 passed by Hon'ble High Court in LPA No.924 of 2017	**Exhibit 'W3'**
Order dated 01.03.2023 passed by Hon'ble High Court in COCP-2200-2017	**Exhibit 'W4'**
Letter dated 17.08.2004 for re-appointment for the post of Mali along with copy of medical certificate	**Exhibit 'W5'**
Letter bearing Endst No.16476-80 dated 29.07.2015 issued by Assistant Registrar, Panjab University to workman	**Exhibit 'W6'**
Reply dated 30.08.2024 filed by Director-cum-PIO, Panjab University, Chandigarh under Right to Information Act, 2005	**Exhibit 'W7'**
Application form dated 04.05.2006 for the post of Mali	**Exhibit 'W8'**
Office order bearing Endst. No.2728-2747/Estt. dated 15.03.2024 of Panjab University, Chandigarh	**Exhibit 'W9'**
Office order bearing Endst. No.9209-9289/Estt. dated 21.08.2024 of Panjab University, Chandigarh	**Exhibit 'W10'**
Order dated 02.09.2015 of Panjab University relating to the matter whereby 9 persons Smt. Prem Lata & Ors. filed their application requesting for regularisation of their services	**Exhibit 'W11'**

Thereafter, Learned Representative for the applicant-workman closed the evidence on behalf of the workman in affirmative.

12. In evidence of the management, Amit Kumar - Senior Assistant, Construction Office, Panjab University, Chandigarh appeared as MW1 and tendered his affidavit Exhibit 'MW1/A' along with documents -

Authority letter dated 24.03.2025 issued in his favour by Divisional Engineer (H), P.U. Construction Office	**Exhibit 'M1'**

Thereafter, the Learned Representative for the management No.1 & 2 closed the evidence on behalf of the management.

13. I have heard the arguments of Learned Representatives for the parties and gone through the case file carefully with their able assistance. My issue-wise findings are as under :-

Issue No. 1 -

14. The workman is required to prove this issue.

15. Learned Representative for the workman submitted that the workman was appointed by the respondent-management as Mali on 24.12.1997 for a fixed tenure of three months and thereafter he was given extensions every three months and his services were terminated illegally by the respondent-management in the year 2003 without any reason. He submitted that juniors to the workman are still in employment of the management. The respondent-University did not allow the workman to do his duty after 03.12.2003. He argued that the services of the workman were terminated forcibly by the respondent-University without any inquiry and termination notice.

16. On the other hand, Learned Representative for the respondent-management submitted that the applicant-workman was appointed against leave vacancy. His services were never terminated by the respondent-University. The University had framed the policy of regularisation and regular posts were advertised and the selected persons were allowed to join. The workman never applied against the advertisement advertised for regular selection. The workman never turned up after 2003 to join his services. He never approached the Registrar, Panjab University in that regard and as such, he is not entitled to any relief.

17. However, before coming to any logical conclusion, it is necessary to discuss the evidence led by both the parties.

18. The workman Subhash Singh himself appeared as AW1 and vide his affidavit Exhibit 'AW1/A' deposed in consonance with the facts detailed in the statement of claim. He deposed that he was appointed as Mali on temporary / contract / adhoc basis on 24.12.1997 by Panjab University for a fixed period of three months. Thereafter, he was given extensions after every three months. He deposed that his services were neither terminated nor he was allowed to do his work and his juniors are still working. Further, the reasons for not allowing him to work / termination remained unknown to him. He deposed that he approached the Hon'ble High Court along with other similarly situated persons by way of CWP No.266 and 8388 of 2003 and the same was disposed off vide order dated 02.08.2004. The said order was challenged by the Panjab University but the Appeal was dismissed by the Hon'ble Apex Court for non-prosecution on 14.05.2015. He deposed that the CWP No.7851 of 2016 was also filed to regularise the services and the same was dismissed by the Single Bench on 15.11.2016 holding that there was delay & latches and thereafter LPA No.924 of 2017 against order dated 15.11.2016 was filed and the same was dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to file contempt proceedings and other proceedings to implement the order dated 02.08.2004 passed in CWP No.388 of 2003 "Om Wati & Others Versus Panjab University & Others". He deposed that the COCP No.2201 & 2202 of 2017 was filed but the Vice-Chancellor placed on record the affidavit that the policy has been framed on 05.03.2001 regarding regularisation of Class 'B' & 'C' employees and thereafter, again on 18.07.2014 policy of Class Employees was framed. He deposed that COCP was rendered infructuous and the liberty was granted to avail the alternative remedy in accordance with law. He submitted that on 28.06.2003, he filed the demand notice before the Assistant Labour Commissioner but no settlement was arrived at. He worked with the management for more than 240 days in a calendar year for the purpose of the ID Act. The services of the workman were terminated without any notice, charge sheet and payment of retrenchment compensation. The respondent-University acted in violation of Section 25F of the ID Act. He further stated that he is not gainfully employed and he had worked in the University from 24.12.1997 to 03.12.2003.

19. On the other hand, MW1 Amit Kumar - Senior Assistant deposed that as per record, the workman had joined the P.U. Construction Office against on 24.12.1997 and he worked continuously up to 01.12.2003. The Panjab University has advertised 44 posts of Malies vide advertisement No.14/2008 but the workman did not apply against the said advertisement. The workman was given an opportunity to file his claim for regularisation as per Panjab University Regularisation Policy vide letter No.16476-80/Estt. dated 29.07.2015. The workman filed his claim. He had worked for 1892 days in total. The total numbers of days required as per policy was 3650 days on or before 31.12.2010 in the consecutive 10 years. He never qualified as per Panjab University Regularisation Policy for regularisation.

This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :
https://egazette.chd.gov.in

20. Admittedly, the workman was appointed as Mali by the Panjab University on temporary / contract / adhoc basis. The applicant-workman submitted that he was appointed on 24.12.1997. The management has not disputed the date of joining of the workman. The information sought under Right to Information Act (Exhibit 'W7') from the respondent-University also mentions his date of joining as 24.12.1997.

21. It is the case of the workman that he had worked with the respondent-University till 03.12.2003. The Learned Representative for the workman submitted that on 03.12.2003, the workman proceeded on leave and went to his native village at Pauri Garhwal for one week with the permission of JE of XEN Office. The workman fell ill in his native village and remained under treatment w.e.f 10.12.2003 to 16.08.2004 in Govt. Ayurvedic Dispensary, Dhantiyal, District Pauri Garhwal. On 17.08.2004, the applicant-workman submitted the medical certificate with Registrar Office, thereafter Registrar Office directed the workman to join XEN Office but Sh. S. S. Saini, Dy. Executive Engineer (H) did not allow the workman to do his work. Onus to prove that the workman was not allowed by the University to do his work after 03.12.2003 laid heavily upon the workman. However, there is no document on record to establish that the workman has proceeded on leave on 03.12.2003 after getting the same sanctioned and he had ever applied for medical leavesupported with medical certificate, as averred by him. The application regarding re-appointment for the post of a Mali (Exhibit 'W5') dated 17.08.2024 moved by the workman is supported with the photocopy of fitness certificate. The medical certificate and the original fitness certificate has not seen the light of the day. The concerned Doctor has not been examined to prove the fact of the illness of the workman. Hence, the entire facts & circumstances in totality establish that the workman did not come present to resume his duty after 03.12.2003.

22. Learned Representative for the workman submitted that the workman had worked with the respondent-management for more than 240 days in a calendar year. The respondent-management has placed on record the attendance register for the month of February, 1998 to December, 2003 (Exhibit 'M2'). MW1 admitted that the workman was in continuous service as per attendance register and he had not taken any leave on any working day other than Sunday. Admittedly, the workman had remained in service of the respondent-University till 03.12.2003 and the testimony of MW1 clearly establishes that the workman has been in continuous service preceding his absence w.e.f. 03.12.2003.

23. Learned Representative for the respondent-management submitted that the Panjab University has advertised 44 post of Malies vide advertisement No.14/2008 and the workman applied for the said post. He submitted that the detailed instructions for Class 'B' & 'C' posts advertised vide advertisement No.14/2008 but he never applied against the same. The aforesaid facts make crystal clear that the workman was given every opportunity to appear for the post of Mali, which was advertised by the respondent-University but he never availed the opportunity and did not participate in the selection process.

24. It is the case of the respondent-university that the workman was also given an opportunity to file his claim for regularisation as per Panjab University Regularisation Policy vide letter No.16476-80/Estt. Dated 29.07.2015. The workman had filed his claim. Since he had worked for 1892 days in total and as such, he did not qualify for regularisation as per approved policy, which requires 3650 days on or before 31.12.2010 in the consecutive ten years and he failed to fall within the purview of regularisation policy.

25. Learned Representative for the workman submitted that the workman was not issued any notice, charge sheet and no retrenchment compensation has been paid to him and as such, the respondent-University has failed to comply with Section 25F of the ID Act.

26. It is not disputed that the workman had worked with the respondent-University till 03.12.2003. Further, at the same time respondent-University admitted that the workman was in continuous service as per the attendance register from the date of joining till December, 2003. The workman had worked with the management for more than 240 days in a calendar year immediately preceding the date of absence.

This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :
https://egazette.chd.gov.in

27. Section 25F of the ID Act embodies conditions precedent to retrenchment of compensation to the effect that no workman employed in any industry who has been in continuous service for not less than one year under an employer shall be retrenched by that employer until the workman has been given one month?s notice in writing indicating the reasons for retrenchment and the period of notice has expired, or the workman has been paid in lieu of such notice, wages for the period of the notice. Further the workman has been paid, at the time of retrenchment compensation, which shall be equivalent to fifteen days' average pay for every completed years of continuous service.

28. In case in hand, the workman was appointed against leave vacancy and he never participated in the selection process against regular posts advertised by respondent-University vide Advertisement No.14/2008. The respondent-University has also considered his claim for regularisation but he did not qualify for regularisation as per approved policy as was not able to fulfil the requisite condition under the Regularisation Policy and therefore, the workman cannot be granted the relief of reinstatement. However, at the same time he had worked with the respondent-University till 03.12.2003 and admittedly, no notice pay or retrenchment compensation has been paid to him and therefore, the workman is entitled for the same. Keeping in view the length of service and last pay drawn by the workman he is entitled to retrenchment compensation to the tune of ` 10,000/-. Hence, this issue stands decided accordingly.

Relief -

29. In view of the aforesaid findings, the industrial dispute in hand stands allowed partly. The workman is held entitled for compensation to the tune of ` 10,000/- from the respondent-University and the respondent-University is directed to comply with the Award within a period of three months from the date of publication of the same in Government Gazette failing which it shall be liable to pay interest at the rate of 8% per annum on the abovesaid amount from the date of the said Award till its actual realisation. Appropriate Government be informed accordingly. Copy of this Award be also sent to Learned District Judge, Chandigarh in view of Sub-section 10 of Section 11 of the Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Act, 2010 for onward transmission of the same to concerned Civil Court. File be consigned to the records.

(Sd.) . . .,

Dated : The 28th August, 2025

(MANISHA JAIN)
UIDNo.PB0158
PRESIDING OFFICER,
Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court,
Union Territory Chandigarh.

Secretary Labour,
Chandigarh Administration.

HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Notification

The 10th November, 2025

No. 202 E.I.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice has been pleased to make the following appointment on the establishment of this Court :-

Sr. No.	Name of the Officer	From	To	Remarks
1.	Shri Amarinder Sharma, Addl. District & Sessions Judge	Kurukshetra	Officer on Special Duty w.e.f. 29.10.2025 (FN) to 28.10.2028 (AN) against the post of Deputy Registrar on the establishment of this Court.	On deputation basis.

BY ORDER OF HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

(Sd.) . . .,

(ASHISH KUMAR BANSAL),
Registrar (Administration)
for Registrar General

This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :
https://egazette.chd.gov.in

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Kamaljit Kaur D/o Parkash # 31, Sector 41-D, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Kamlesh.

[1898-1]

I, Luxmi W/o Bhagwan Dass R/o House No. 2468, Mauli Jagran Chandigarh, have changed my minor son name from Pamod to Parmod.

[1899-1]

I, Chaudhari Dharmendra S/o Vijay Singh # CRPF Campus, Hallo Majra, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Dharmendra Singh.

[1900-1]

I, Ranjana Chhoker Wife of Sh. Sundeep R/o # 3407/2, Sector 46-C, Chandigarh, have changed my name from Ranjana Chhoker to Ranjana.

[1901-1]

I, Brajindra W/o Satinder Singh Residing at House No. 102, Sector 35-A, Chandigarh, have changed my name from Brajindra to Brajindra Dhir.

[1902-1]

I, Bitton S/o Sh. Sadiq Ali R/o H. No. 6043, Maloya Colony, have changed my name from Bitton to Mohamad Ashik.

[1903-1]

I, Mehndi Hassan S/o Anait Mohammed R/o House No. 229, Milk Colony, Dhanas, Chandigarh, have changed my name from Mahendi Hasan to Mehndi Hassan.

[1904-1]

I, Raghuvansh S/o Bhimal Madho R/o # 192-A, Small Flats Dhanas, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Raghuvansh Mahto.

[1905-1]

I, Naresh Kumar @ Naresh Gandhi S/o Himmat Ram R/o House No 1082, Sector 19-B, Chandigarh, have changed my name from Naresh Kumar @ Naresh Gandhi to Naresh Kumar Gandhi.

[1906-1]

I, Jasvir Kaur W/o Gurcharan Singh R/o # 2006/2, Sector 45-C, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Jasbir Kaur.

[1907-1]

I, Azad S/o Deep Chand R/o 1410 NIC, Manimajra Chandigarh, have changed my name from Azad to Ajad.

[1908-1]

I, Anil Kumar Sangwan S/o Sh. Dayanand, R/o H. No. 19-A, Bhagwanpura, Manimajra, Chandigarh-160101, have changed my name from Anil Kumar Sangwan to Anil Kumar.

[1909-1]

I, Vijay Singh S/o Kusheswar Singh, R/o # 5582, Maloya Colony, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Vijay Kumar.

[1910-1]

I, Shehnazderam W/o Dildar Khan, R/o House No. 727, Bori Wali Gali, Village-Daria, Chandigarh. That I have changed my name from Shehnazderam to Salamati.

[1911-1]

"No legal responsibility is accepted for the contents of publication of advertisements/public notices in this part of the Chandigarh Administration Gazette. Persons notifying the advertisements/public notices will remain solely responsible for the legal consequences and also for any other misrepresentation etc."

159—Ptg. & Sty. Deptt., U.T., Chd.

This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :
https://egazette.chd.gov.in